

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 7-11 were examined by the Office, and in the Office Action of November 20, 2009 all claims are rejected. With this response, claim 1 is amended, and new claim 12 is added. All amendments and new claims are fully supported by the specification as originally filed. Support for the amendments can be found at least from page 11, line 15—page 12, line 14. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in view of the following discussion.

Claim Objections

In section 3, on page 3 of the Office Action, claim 1 is objected to due to informalities. Claim 1 is amended to recite “each are connected to the terminal electrode via a contact hole,” in order to clarify that each of the two metallic lines are connected to the terminal electrode by a contact hole. Therefore, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection to claim 1.

Claim Rejections Under § 103

In section 5, on page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1 and 7-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Song et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,851,918) in view of Takizawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,742,074), and in further view of Lee et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,587,160). Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, because the cited references at least fail to disclose or suggest all of the limitations recited in claim 1. Claim 1 is amended to recite that the second metallic line which is formed in the side where the TFT array substrate is cut off or chamfered off, is formed beneath both the gating insulating film and the passivation film. Applicant respectfully submits that at least this limitation is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references.

In contrast to claim 1, Song shows in Figure 12 a gate pad (24a) beneath an insulation layer (28) and a passivation layer (36), however the gate pad (24a) is not formed in the side where the TFT array substrate is cut off or chamfered off, as recited in amended claim 1 with respect to the second metallic line. Instead, the gate pad (24a) is formed in a region of the substrate (22) at which a gate pad and pad electrode for the TFT are formed. See Song column 4, lines 13-14. Therefore, the region in which the gate pad (24a) is formed is not a side of the TFT array substrate that is cut or chamfered off, and therefore the gate pad (24a) discussed in

Song cannot correspond to the second metallic line recited in claim 1. However, the Office acknowledges that this on page 5 of the Office Action, and relies upon Lee for this teaching.

Applicant respectfully disagrees that Lee makes up for the deficiencies in the teachings of Song. Claim 1 is amended to clarify that the second metallic line is formed beneath both the gate insulating film and the passivation film. In Lee, as shown in Figure 14 only the dummy gate line (111) is formed beneath both the gate insulating film (3) and the interlayer insulating film (4). However, as shown in Figure 3 of Lee the dummy gate line (111) is not formed in the side where the TFT array substrate is cut off or chamfered off, as required by claim 1 with respect to the second metallic line. Instead, the cutting line (11) shown in Figure 3 of Lee crosses over data line (200), which is not formed beneath both the gate insulating film and the passivation film. Therefore, even the combination of the cited references fails to disclose or suggest all of the limitations recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, as discussed on page 12, lines 6-14, as a result of the arrangement recited in claim 1, the supplementary line, i.e. second metallic line, is not scraped or only slightly scraped through the chamfering process, so that occurrence of the peeled metal pieces is minimized and occurrence of short circuits between terminals is prevented. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references.

Claims 7-11 ultimately depend from independent claim 1, and therefore are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references at least in view of their dependencies.

New Claim 12

New claim 12 ultimately depends from independent claim 1, and therefore is believed to be novel and nonobvious over the cited references at least in view of its dependency.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited. The undersigned hereby authorizes the Commissioner to charge Deposit Account No. 23-0442 for any fee deficiency required to submit this response.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 19 February 2009

Keith R. Obert

Keith R. Obert
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 58,051

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
Bradford Green, Building Five
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468
Telephone: (203) 261-1234
Facsimile: (203) 261-5676
USPTO Customer No. 004955